

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. By this paper, claim 6 is proposed to be amended. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite for reciting the limitation "the platform" in lines 6, 12 and 15. By this paper, claim 6 is proposed to be amended to delete this recitation and improve the definiteness of the claim. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are respectfully requested in order to place this claim into condition for allowance or to narrow the issues for appeal.

Final Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over several references including as primary reference, U.S. patent number 6,233,325 to Frech, et al. ("Frech").

Frech fails to show, describe or suggest use of a subscriber profile as required by independent claims 1 and 8. The final office action asserts that the claim 1 limitation of "retrieving a subscriber profile for the called party" is met by Frech FIG. 1, elements 4 and 5 and by the text at Frech, column 7, lines 30-45. However, the method steps in the drawing merely show sending a termination attempt request from the terminating switch to the SCP in the system and responding with a call forward message from the SCP to the switch. The specification at column 7, lines 30-45 adds that storage of call control information can be moved from the SCP to an SCN/IP in the network so that "the SCN/IP does not require additional information from the SCP after step 10, because it has received and stored all the information about the caller, called party and service,"

column 7, lines 39-41. The stated benefit is that "the SCN/IP can be provided with greater autonomy and make fewer requests for direction from the SCP," column 7, lines 36-38. "Thus, all the subsequent steps of querying the SCP by the SCN/IP are eliminated." Column 7, lines 41-42. Thus, Frech suggests in an alternate embodiment moving call processing information for the system from one location (the SCP) to another (the SCN/IP) to reduce communication in the system, not for providing additional features or capabilities or convenience for a subscriber.

In fact, Frech makes no mention of a subscriber profile which can be retrieved and which defines call screening information for the called party, and which can be used to determine which kind of screening is active for the called party to determine routing for a call, all of which are required by claim 1. Independent claim 8 includes similar limitations which are not shown by Frech. Further, claim 2 recites "determining if the subscriber profile is valid." Frech completely fails to disclose this limitation because Frech fails to disclose a subscriber profile as required by claims 1 and 8. The additionally-cited references do not provide the missing teaching.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-8 are allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-3 and 8 stand rejected under the doctrine of obviousness type double patenting. According to the previous office action, these claims are unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. patent number 6,631,182.

As requested by the examiner, a Terminal Disclaimer in obviation of this rejection is submitted herewith.

Application no. 10/639,610
Amendment dated: August 29, 2005
Reply to office action dated: June 29, 2005

With this response, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance.
Should the examiner deem a telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John G. Rauch", is written over a horizontal line.

John G. Rauch
Registration No. 37,218
Attorney for Applicant

August 29, 2005
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200